Generalized Pseudopotentials for the Anisotropic Fractional Quantum Hall Effect

Bo Yang,[1] Zi-Xiang Hu,[2] Ching Hua Lee,[1] and Z. Papić[3]

[1]*Institute of High Performance Computing, A*STAR, Singapore, 138632.*
[2]*Department of Physics, Chongqing University, Chongqing, P.R. China, 401331.*
[3]*School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK*

(Dated: September 23, 2016)

Haldane pseudopotentials have played a key role in the study of the fractional quantum Hall (FQH) effect as they allow an arbitrary rotationally-invariant interaction to be expanded over projectors onto the two-particle eigenstates of relative angular momentum. Here we introduce a more general class of pseudopotentials that form a complete basis in the cases where rotational symmetry is explicitly broken, e.g., due to tilted magnetic field or anisotropic band structure. Similar to the standard isotropic pseudopotentials, the generalized pseudopotentials are also parametrized by a unimodular metric, which groups the effective interactions into equivalence classes, and is particularly useful in determining optimal model Hamiltonians of the anisotropic FQH fluids. We show that purely anisotropic pseudopotentials lead to new types of bound "molecular" states for a few particles in an infinite plane. We discuss realizations of the generalized pseudopotentials in systems with tilted magnetic field, as well as fractional Chern insulators harboring intrinsic anisotropy due to the underlying lattice structure.

PACS numbers: 73.43.Lp, 71.10.Pm

arXiv:1609.06730v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 21 Sep 2016

The fractional quantum Hall system is host to a wide variety of topological phases of matter [1]. This complexity belies the deceivingly simple microscopic Hamiltonian containing only the effective Coulomb interaction projected to a single Landau level (LL) [2]. The understanding of different topological states was greatly facilitated by the concept of *pseudopotentials* (PPs) introduced by Haldane [3, 4]. This formalism allows to expand any rotationally-invariant interaction over the complete basis of the PPs, which are projection operators onto two-particle states with a given value of relative angular momentum. Furthermore, a combination of a small number of PPs naturally defines parent Hamiltonians for some FQH model states, such as the Laughlin states [5, 6]. The method has also been generalized to many-body PPs [7, 8], which form the parent Hamiltonians of the non-Abelian FQH states [9, 10]. In many cases, the ground state of these model Hamiltonians is believed to be adiabatically connected to the actual ground state of the system. Thus, the relatively simple (and to some degree analytically tractable) model wavefunctions and Hamiltonians give much insight into the nature of the experimentally realized FQH states.

Recently, there has been renewed interest in the FQH effect due to connections forged between topological order, geometry and broken symmetry. It was pointed out early on [4] that rotational invariance is not necessary for the FQH effect (indeed, experimental systems break rotational symmetry). This lead to the conclusion that FQH states possess new "geometrical" degrees of freedom [11], uncovering a more complete description of their low-energy properties [12–14]. The notion of geometry has also inspired the construction of a more general class of Laughlin states with non-Euclidean metric [15], which were shown to be physically relevant in situations where the band mass or dielectric tensor is anisotropic [16–18], or the magnetic field has been tilted [19]. On the other hand, an exciting possibility of the co-existence of topological order with broken symmetry [20, 21], leading to the "nematic" FQH effect, has also been proposed [22, 23]. The nematic order is expected to arise due to spontaneous symmetry breaking, as suggested by recent numerical evidence [24] and experiments [25].

A missing ingredient for the complete microscopic description of the mentioned geometry and broken symmetry in the FQH effect is the formulation of PPs for systems which lack rotational invariance. We characterize "rotational invariance" by the metric entering the Fourier transform of the effective interaction, $V(q_x, q_y)$, which includes the bare Coulomb potential and the LL form factor [2]. As long as this interaction is a function of a single metric g, i.e., $V(q_x, q_y) = V(|q| = \sqrt{g^{ab} q_a q_b})$, we refer to the system as "rotationally invariant", even though the metric g may not necessarily be Euclidean or circular in the lab frame. It is always possible to perform a trivial coordinate transformation back to the Euclidean metric. In contrast, if the bare Coulomb potential and LL form factor have different metrics, the rotational symmetry is truly broken and the conventional notion of the PPs does not apply.

In this paper, we extend Haldane's approach [3] and construct a complete basis of the generalized PPs for *any* two-body effective interactions. In particular, this allows to study the anisotropic FQH systems in the universal language of the generalized PPs. While an anisotropic system manifestly does not have a preferred metric, the generalized PPs are still parameterised by a single metric; the variation of this unimodular metric allows us to systematically classify anisotropic interactions into equivalence classes with identical physical properties, and to

identify dominant PPs variationally. We exemplify this procedure for FQH systems in the tilted magnetic field and fractional Chern insulators. We also study general features of ground states of purely anisotropic PPs, including new types of bound states with "molecular" structure in the thermodynamic limit. These states thus have radically different physics from the ground states of regular PPs [2]; the combination of the two types of PPs may give rise to new types of many-body states that combine topological order with broken rotational symmetry.

Generalized pseudopotentials.– Any two-body FQH Hamiltonian, projected to a single LL, is given by:

$$\mathcal{H} = \int \frac{d^2 q \ell_B^2}{(2\pi)^2} V_{\vec{q}} \bar{\rho}_{\vec{q}} \bar{\rho}_{-\vec{q}}, \tag{1}$$

where $\bar{\rho}_{\vec{q}} = \sum_i e^{iq_a R_i^a}$ is the guiding-center density operator with momentum $\vec{q} = (q_x, q_y)$. The guiding center coordinates satisfy $[R^a, R^b] = -i\epsilon^{ab}\ell_B^2$, where $a = (x, y)$, ϵ^{ab} is the anti-symmetric tensor and ℓ_B is the magnetic length (we set $\ell_B = 1$). The effective interaction within a LL, $V_{\vec{q}}$, can be written as $V_{\vec{q}} = V_{\vec{q}}^{\text{bare}} F_N(\vec{q})^2$, with the bare interaction $V_{\vec{q}}^{\text{bare}}$ (the Coulomb potential) and $F_N(\vec{q})$ the form factor of the electrons in the N^{th} LL. In the simplest case with infinitesimal sample thickness, $F_N(\vec{q}) = F_N(|q|_l)$ and $V_{\vec{q}}^{\text{bare}} = V_{|q|_c}^{\text{bare}}$, with $|q|_l = \sqrt{q_a q_b g_l^{ab}}$ and $|q|_c = \sqrt{q_a q_b g_c^{ab}}$; the metric g_l^{ab} comes from the effective mass tensor that defines the LLs, and g_c^{ab} is from the dielectric tensor defining the shape of the equipotential lines around the electrons [11].

It is convenient to rewrite $g_{ab} = \omega_a^* \omega_b + \omega_a \omega_b^*$, with $\epsilon^{ab}\omega_a^*\omega_b = i$. The relevant Hilbert space is spanned by two-particle states $|m\rangle$ with relative angular momentum m [4]. (We ignore the center of mass degree of freedom since it is trivially conserved by Eq.(1).) Rewriting $q_a = \mathbf{q}\omega_a + \mathbf{q}^*\omega_a^*$, we obtain the fundamental expression for the matrix element (assuming $\Delta m \equiv (m' - m) > 0$):

$$\langle m|\bar{\rho}_{\vec{q}}\bar{\rho}_{-\vec{q}}|m'\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{m!}{m'!}} \left(i\sqrt{2}\mathbf{q}^*\right)^{\Delta m} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|q|^2} L_m^{\Delta m}\left(|q|^2\right). \tag{2}$$

Here m, m' are even for bosons and odd for fermions, and $L_m^n(x)$ is the generalized Laguerre polynomial. It is then clear from Eq.(1) that if $V_{\vec{q}}$ is rotationally symmetric with metric $g_l^{ab} = g_c^{ab} = g^{ab}$, then $\langle m|\mathcal{H}|m'\rangle \sim \sum_n c_n \delta_{m,n}\delta_{m',n}$. The interaction can then be decomposed into the standard Haldane PPs $V_m(|q|)$ as $V_{|q|} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c_m V_m(|q|)$, where $V_m(|q|) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}|q|^2} L_m\left(|q|^2\right)$. Many FQH states can be described by model Hamiltonians made of a linear combination of certain V_m.

We now focus on the anisotropic $V_{\vec{q}}$ (e.g., $g_l^{ab} \neq g_c^{ab}$). In this case, the Haldane PPs no longer form a complete basis. We define the *generalized PPs* as follows:

$$V_{m,n}^{g+}(\vec{q}) = \lambda_n \mathcal{N}_{mn} \left(L_m^n\left(|q|^2\right) e^{-\frac{1}{2}|q|^2} \mathbf{q}^n + c.c\right), \tag{3}$$

$$V_{m,n}^{g-}(\vec{q}) = -i\mathcal{N}_{mn} \left(L_m^n\left(|q|^2\right) e^{-\frac{1}{2}|q|^2} \mathbf{q}^n - c.c\right), \tag{4}$$



FIG. 1: (Color online) Contours of the leading-order fermionic V_1 (isotropic) and $V_{1,2}$ anisotropic pseudopotential. The metric of the PPs is chosen to be unity.

where the normalization factors are $\mathcal{N}_{mn} \equiv \sqrt{2^{n-1} m!/(\pi\,(m+n)!)}$, and $\lambda_n = 1/\sqrt{2}$ for $n = 0$ or $\lambda_n = 1$ for $n \neq 0$. The generalized PP is a function of $|q|^2 = g^{ab} q_a q_b$, i.e., it is parametrized by an arbitrary unimodular metric $\det g = 1$. Physically, for $n \neq 0$, $V_{m,n}^{g+}$ is equivalent to $V_{m,n}^{g-}$ up to a rotation of $\frac{\pi}{2n}$ in the momentum space. Different generalized PPs are mutually orthogonal: $\int d^2 q V_{m,n}^{(g\pm)}(\vec{q}) V_{m',n'}^{(g\pm)}(\vec{q}) = \delta_{m,m'}\delta_{n,n'}\delta_{+,-}$, and any effective interaction can be expanded as

$$V_{\vec{q}} = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \left(c_{m,n}^{g+} V_{m,n}^{g+}(\vec{q}) + c_{m,n}^{g-} V_{m,n}^{g-}(\vec{q})\right), \tag{5}$$

where the coefficients are given by

$$c_{m,n}^{g(\pm)} = \int d^2 q V_{\vec{q}} V_{m,n}^{(g\pm)}(\vec{q}). \tag{6}$$

It is thus clear that the Haldane PPs are special cases of $V_{m,n}^{(g+)}$ with $n = 0$ (and $V_{m,0}^{g-} = 0$), so we can write $V_{m,0}^{g+} = V_m^g, c_{m,0}^{g+} = c_m^g, c_{m,0}^{g-} = 0$. If $V_{\vec{q}}$ is rotationally invariant with metric g, then $c_{m,n}^{g(\pm)} = 0$ if $n \neq 0$, and the Haldane PPs form a complete basis. For fermions, the shortest-range generalized PP is $V_{1,n}$; the quadrupolar contour profile of $V_{1,2}$ is compared against the isotropic V_1 Haldane PP in Fig. 1.

Intra-LL "Molecules"– To gain some intuition about the generalized PPs, it is instructive to study the spectrum of the simplest anisotropic PP, $V_{\vec{q}} = V_{1,2}^{g+}$, for small numbers of particles on an infinite disk. From Eq.(2) it is clear that the ground state of a few electrons is a bound state with negative energy. The bound states can be understood as the "molecular levels" of these particles, and the guiding-center density profile of such "molecules" in the center of mass (guiding-center) angular momentum $M = 0$ sector are plotted in Fig.(2).

Note that, unlike Hamiltonians with rotational symmetry, for anisotropic Hamiltonian the effect of the disk boundary on the ground state cannot be removed for any finite system size, and M is not a good quantum number. For bound states in a large disk, however, the



FIG. 2: (Color online) The guiding-center density $\langle\Psi|\rho_q|\Psi\rangle$ (a-c) and energy spectrum (d) of a 3-electron molecule on the disk with 30 magnetic orbitals. The density is evaluated in the ground state (a), first-excited state (b), and the highest-energy "anti-bonding" state (c).The states are obtained by exact diagonalization of $V_{\vec{q}} = V_{1,2}^{g+}$ in $M = 0$ sector.

particle density decays exponentially towards the boundary, so that the diagonalization within sub-Hilbert spaces of small M are excellent approximations. The guiding-center density plots in Fig.(2) thus represent very well the "molecular structures" of the few particle states in an infinite plane at $M = 0$. For three electrons, the ground state reflects an interesting bonding structure between the particles. There is also a localised "anti-bonding" state at the highest energy, and the spectrum as a function of M is symmetric about the zero energy. These properties are qualitatively the same for any small clusters of particles, and will be studied in more details elsewhere.

We also point out that for two particles with

$$V_{\vec{q}} = V_1^{\eta} + \lambda V_{1,2}^{\eta+}, \tag{7}$$

the ground state is clearly a bound state no matter how small λ is. One can easily construct an effective interaction $V_{\vec{q}}$ consisting of $V_0^g, V_{1,0}^g, V_{2,0}^g$ and $V_{1,2}^{g\pm}$ so that $V_{\vec{q}} > 0$ for all $\vec{q}$; Eq.(1) has bound states even when the interaction is repulsive everywhere, and the properties of these bound states are qualitatively the same as those in Fig.(2), with the "molecule" size increasing as λ decreases. This is a rather unique feature for particles within a single LL whose kinetic energy is quenched. In contrast, for free particles in two-dimensional space, no bound states exist for repulsive interactions.

Variation of the PP metric– For more general cases, the metric g on the RHS of Eq.(5) is a free parameter; for a specific $V_{\vec{q}}$, if we define a coefficient vector $\vec{c}_g$ with $c_{m,n}^{g(\pm)}$ as entries, it is a vector with the length of $\|\vec{c}_g\| = \int d^2q V_{\vec{q}}^2$ that is independent of the metric g. The Hamiltonian of Eq.(1), on the other hand, is invariant under an $SO(2,1)$ unitary transformation of the metric [26], implying that for each $V_{\vec{q}}$ there is an equivalence class of effective interactions with $\vec{c}_g$ given by Eq.(6), all leading to the same spectrum of the respective Hamiltonian. We can write the equivalence class to which $V_{\vec{q}}$ belongs as follows:

$$V_{\vec{q},g} = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \left(c_{m,n}^{g+} V_{m,n}^{+}(\vec{q}) + c_{m,n}^{g-} V_{m,n}^{-}(\vec{q})\right) \tag{8}$$

It consists of interactions $V_{\vec{q},g}$ parametrized by g, where $V_{m,n}^{(\pm)}(\vec{q})$ have the coordinate metric of $V_{\vec{q}}$ in Eq.(5), which is typically in lab frame and not necessarily congruent with g. The LHS of Eq.(8) are basically interactions related to each other by a stretch and a rotation, leading to the same spectrum of the Hamiltonian.

While the equivalence class can be trivially detected when $V_{\vec{q}}$ contains a unique metric, it is less obvious when $V_{\vec{q}}$ is anisotropic – two seemingly different interactions can be in the same equivalence class, essentially describing the same physical system. This is also important for the determination of the proper model Hamiltonians that are adiabatically connected to the realistic Hamiltonians with anisotropic $V_{\vec{q}}$: one can tune the metric on the RHS of Eq.(5) to maximise the coefficient of a specific set of PPs. If we parametrize the metric in terms of Pauli matrices σ_i as $g = \sin 2\phi \sinh 2\theta \sigma_x + \cosh 2\theta \mathbb{I} + \sinh 2\theta \cos 2\phi \sigma_z$, we obtain the following interesting relationship which is particularly useful for maximising c_1^g:

$$\partial_\theta V_1^g = \sqrt{3} V_{1,2}^{g+}. \tag{9}$$

This implies, according to Eq.(6), that the metric which maximises c_1^g also leads to the vanishing of $c_{1,2}^{g+}$. Thus for an isotropic Hamiltonian of which the $\mu = 1/3$ Laughlin state is the ground state, the leading correction of adding $V_{1,2}^{g\pm}$ is to alter the intrinsic metric of the Laughlin state [15, 26], as long as the spectrum remains gapped.

We now illustrate this with Eq.(7) above. Without loss of generality we set the metric on the RHS to be $\eta = \mathbb{I}_{2\times 2}$. The equivalent $V_{q,g}$ with the metric that maximises c_1^g can be found variationally, which is pertinent at $\nu = 1/3$ filling factor. Formally we have

$$V_{\vec{q}} \sim V_{\vec{q},g} = c_1^g V_1^g + {\sum_{m,n}}' c_{m,n}^{g+} V_{m,n}^{g+}(\vec{q}) \tag{10}$$

where the primed summation excludes $V_{1,2}^{g+}$ and V_1^g; the $V_{m,n}^{g-}$ are not present because of the symmetry of $V_{1,2}^{\eta+}$. Treating the second term of Eq.(7) and Eq.(10) as the perturbation to the 1/3 Laughlin state, the strength of perturbation of $V_{\vec{q}}$ is λ. Given that the coefficient vector is invariant under the unimodular transformation, the



FIG. 3: (Color online) (a) The metric parameter θ which maximises c^g_{10} as a function of λ in Eq.(7). (b) The dependence of the strength of perturbation on λ. Note that λ is also the strength of perturbation of the equivalent interaction in Eq.(7). By choosing the metric that maximises c^g_1, the strength of perturbation is substantially reduced, especially when λ is small.

strength of perturbation of $V_{\vec{q},g}$ is

$$\epsilon_g = \sqrt{\sum_{mn}{}' \left(c^{g+}_{m,n}\right)^2} = \sqrt{1+\lambda^2-\left(c^g_{1,0}\right)^2}/c^g_{1,0} \qquad (11)$$

The dependence of θ on g and ϵ_g as a function of λ are shown in Fig.(3). It is clear that the main effect of $V^{g\pm}_{1,2}$ is to modify the metric of the 1/3 Laughlin liquid. In contrast, if one replaces $V^{g\pm}_{1,2}$ in Eq.(7) with other anisotropic PPs, the metric that maximises the V^g_1 component remains as η according to Eq.(9), and the incompressibility gap will be reduced much more significantly.

Physical Realizations of Anisotropic PPs – The generalized PPs are useful for quantifying the anisotropic contribution when rotational symmetry is broken in a FQH system. This is because generalized PPs give us a discrete set of coefficients with transparent physical interpretation. We briefly illustrate this with two examples. In Fig.(4) we show the coefficients of the prominent generalized PPs for FQH systems with tilted magnetic field, and for a realization of the fractional Chern insulator (FCI), the lattice analogue of a FQH system, where geometry was recently shown to play an important role [27].

We model the tilted magnetic field by ω_x, the cyclotron frequency of the in-plane magnetic field, and assume finite thickness due to harmonic well potential $\omega_0^2 z^2/2$ [48]. Both ω_x and ω_0 are measured in units of ω_z, the perpendicular field cyclotron frequency. In Fig. 4(a), we decompose the effective Coulomb interaction in the lowest LL and $N=1$ LL in terms of the dominant anisotropic PPs, i.e., we plot the coefficient of $V^{g+}_{3,2}$, normalised by c^g_1, as a function of ω_x for several values of ω_0. The metric is chosen as the one that maximises c^g_1. Note at this metric $c^{g\pm}_{1,2}=0$. Interestingly, the anisotropy induced by the tilt is actually rather small, even for very large tilting angles (see Fig. 4 (a)).

On the other hand, large anisotropic PP components can naturally exist in FCIs [28–40]. Since interactions on a lattice are intrinsically directional, FCIs can possess



FIG. 4: (Color online) (a) The magnitude of $V^{g+}_{3,2}$ induced by the in-plane field of cyclotron frequency ω_x. The coefficient of $V^{g+}_{3,2}$ is normalised by c^g_1, evaluated at the metric that maximises c^g_1. We show the results for $N=0$ (LLL) and $N=1$ (1LL) Landau level, and several thickness parameters ω_0. (b) Anisotropic PPs in an FCI model. Left: the coefficients of anisotropic PPs for a quadrupole interaction $V_q = \cos q_x - \cos q_y$, whose isotropic PPs vanish. The first two PPs dominate. Right: PP magnitudes $c_{m,0}$,$c_{m,2}$,$c_{m,4}$ for $V_q = \cos q_x$. $V_{m,2}$ is of comparable magnitude as the isotropic PP V_m, at least for $m=0$ and 1.

anisotropic PPs that are even larger than the isotropic ones. The PP decomposition of an FCI involves a basis mapping between the single-body orbitals of the FCI and FQH systems [41–46]. We adopt the mapping introduced in Ref.[47], which maps a Chern number C Chern band to a *single* LL with C-fold degeneracy [49] without introducing basis anisotropy [42–44, 46]. For a clean realization of large PP FCIs, we choose a Chern insulator with almost uniform Berry curvature and Fubini-Study metric, so as to confine rotational symmetry breaking to the interaction. Hence an interaction with predefined symmetry (i.e., d-wave) will only lead to anisotropic PPs of that symmetry. Using the 3-band, Chern number 3 model [48], we plot in Fig.4(b) its PP coefficients computed via Eq. 6 for nearest neighbour interactions of the (unprojected) form $V_q = \cos q_x$ or $V_q = \cos q_x - \cos q_y$. In the former case, $V_{m,2}$ is of comparable magnitude as the isotropic PP $V_{m,0}$ (at least for $m=0$ and 1), while in the latter (quadrupole) case, the isotropic PPs cancel and we are left only with anisotropic PPs.

Conclusions. We have formulated a set of generalized PPs that completely describe any two-body effective interactions within a single LL. We showed that the parameter space of the PP coefficients form equivalence classes; effective interactions from the same equivalence class are parametrized by a unimodular metric. For incompressible topological phases, one may choose a $V_{\vec{q}}$ from the corresponding equivalence class with a particular metric, with which most of the generalized PPs can be truncated without closing the gap. The truncated $V_{\vec{q}}$ belongs to a different equivalence class, so the generalized PPs are thus useful to understand the merging of equivalence classes of effective interactions with topologically gapped states.

The generalized PPs, possibly in combination with

standard isotropic PPs, may give rise to new topological states with broken symmetry at finite filling factors. Moreover, it would be interesting to study the dynamics of the few-particle "molecular" bound states for purely anisotropic PPs in the limit of vanishing filling factor. In addition, the generalized PPs can be used to study the effect of tilted magnetic field in a simpler and more systematic manner. The leading order PPs like $V_{1,2}$ have manifestly quadrupolar structure, thus they may offer a mechanism to explicitly break symmetry and drive the system into FQH nematic phase. Finally, it would be important to study many-body phases at large anisotropy which is present in realistic FCI models.

Acknowledgements. Zi-Xiang Hu was supported by NSFC No.1127403, 11674041 and FRF for the Central Universities No.CQDXWL-2014-Z006.

[1] D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1559 (1982), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.48.1559.

[2] R. Prange and S. Girvin, *The Quantum Hall effect*, Graduate texts in contemporary physics (Springer-Verlag, 1987), ISBN 9783540962861, URL https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=Y7XvAAAAMAAJ.

[3] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 605 (1983), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.51.605.

[4] F. D. M. Haldane, *The Quantum Hall Effect* (Springer, New York, 1990).

[5] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.50.1395.

[6] S. A. Trugman and S. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 5280 (1985), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.31.5280.

[7] S. H. Simon, E. H. Rezayi, and N. R. Cooper, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 075318 (2007), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.75.075318.

[8] C. H. Lee, Z. Papić, and R. Thomale, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 041003 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.5.041003.

[9] G. Moore and N. Read, Nuclear Physics B **360**, 362 (1991), ISSN 0550-3213.

[10] N. Read and E. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 8084 (1999), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.59.8084.

[11] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 116801 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.116801.

[12] T. Can, M. Laskin, and P. Wiegmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 046803 (2014), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.046803.

[13] B. Bradlyn and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 125303 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.125303.

[14] A. Gromov, G. Y. Cho, Y. You, A. G. Abanov, and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 016805 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.016805.

[15] R.-Z. Qiu, F. D. M. Haldane, X. Wan, K. Yang, and S. Yi, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 115308 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.85.115308.

[16] B. Yang, Z. Papić, E. H. Rezayi, R. N. Bhatt, and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 165318 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.85.165318.

[17] H. Wang, R. Narayanan, X. Wan, and F. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 035122 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.86.035122.

[18] V. M. Apalkov and T. Chakraborty, Solid State Communications **177**, 128 (2014), ISSN 0038-1098, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038109813004833.

[19] Z. Papić, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 245315 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.87.245315.

[20] J. Xia, J. P. Eisenstein, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, Nat Phys **7**, 845 (2011), ISSN 1745-2473, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nphys2118.

[21] M. Mulligan, C. Nayak, and S. Kachru, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 085102 (2010), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.82.085102.

[22] J. Maciejko, B. Hsu, S. A. Kivelson, Y. Park, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 125137 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.88.125137.

[23] Y. You, G. Y. Cho, and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 041050 (2014), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.4.041050.

[24] N. Regnault, J. Maciejko, S. A. Kivelson, and S. L. Sondhi, arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02178 (2016).

[25] N. Samkharadze, K. A. Schreiber, G. C. Gardner, M. J. Manfra, E. Fradkin, and G. A. Csathy, Nat Phys **12**, 191 (2016), ISSN 1745-2473, article, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nphys3523.

[26] F. D. M. Haldane, arXiv preprint arXiv:0906.1854 (2009).

[27] T. S. Jackson, G. Moller, and R. Roy, Nat Commun **6** (2015), article, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9629.

[28] D. N. Sheng, Z.-C. Gu, K. Sun, and L. Sheng, Nat Commun **2**, 389 (2011), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ncomms1380.

[29] K. Sun, Z. Gu, H. Katsura, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 236803 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.236803.

[30] E. Tang, J.-W. Mei, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 236802 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.236802.

[31] T. Neupert, L. Santos, C. Chamon, and C. Mudry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 236804 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.236804.

[32] N. Regnault and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. X **1**, 021014 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.1.021014.

[33] D. Xiao, W. Zhu, Y. Ran, N. Nagaosa, and S. Okamoto, Nat Commun **2**, 596 (2011), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ncomms1602.

[34] S. A. Parameswaran, R. Roy, and S. L. Sondhi, Comptes Rendus Physique **14**, 816 (2013), ISSN 1631-0705, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S163107051300073X.

[35] E. J. BERGHOLTZ and Z. LIU, International Journal of Modern Physics B **27**, 1330017 (2013),

http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/pdf/10.1142/S021797921330017X, URL http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S021797921330017X.

[36] N. Y. Yao, A. V. Gorshkov, C. R. Laumann, A. M. Läuchli, J. Ye, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 185302 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.185302.

[37] W. Witczak-Krempa, G. Chen, Y. B. Kim, and L. Balents, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics **5**, 57 (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-020911-125138, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-020911-125138.

[38] M. Barkeshli, N. Y. Yao, and C. R. Laumann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 026802 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.026802.

[39] D. Kasinathan, K. Koepernik, L. H. Tjeng, and M. W. Haverkort, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 195127 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.195127.

[40] N. Goldman, J. C. Budich, and P. Zoller, Nat Phys **12**, 639 (2016), ISSN 1745-2473, progress Article, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nphys3803.

[41] Y.-L. Wu, B. A. Bernevig, and N. Regnault, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 075116 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.85.075116.

[42] X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 126803 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.126803.

[43] C.-M. Jian and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 165134 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.88.165134.

[44] C. H. Lee, R. Thomale, and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 035101 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.88.035101.

[45] Y.-L. Wu, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 106802 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.106802.

[46] C. H. Lee and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 085103 (2014), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.90.085103.

[47] M. Claassen, C. H. Lee, R. Thomale, X.-L. Qi, and T. P. Devereaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 236802 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.236802.

[48] See Supplemental Online Material.

[49] It thus avoids the complications of inter-LL mixings introduced by alternative mapping schemes (but see Ref. 45).

Supplemental Online Material for "Generalized Pseudopotentials for the Anisotropic Fractional Quantum Hall Effect"

In this supplementary material we include some technical details on how we obtain the effective interaction $V_{\vec{q}}$ for the two physical systems mentioned in the main text: the quantum Hall system with a tilted magnetic field, and the FCI system where anisotropy is induced by the lattice structure.

QUANTUM HALL SYSTEMS WITH TILTED MAGNETIC FIELD AND FINITE THICKNESS

We assume the quantum Hall system is confined to a two-dimensional sample with finite thickness. A strong magnetic field is applied perpendicular to the sample in the z-direction. To model the tilted field, we assume an additional component of the in-plane magnetic field is present along the x-direction. The single particle Hamiltonian is then given by:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{2m}\left((P_x+eA_x)^2+(P_y+eA_y)^2+(P_z+eA_z)^2\right) \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{2}m\omega_0^2 z^2 \end{aligned} \tag{S1}$$

Here we model the finite thickness of the Hall sample with a harmonic well. We define the canonical momentum $\pi_i = P_i + eA_i$, with $i = 1, 2, 3$ along directions x, y, z. We also define $\pi_4 = m\omega_0 z$. Thus Eq.(S1) can be written as

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}\left(\pi_1^2+\pi_2^2+\pi_3^2+\pi_4^2\right), \tag{S2}$$

with the following commutation relationships

$$\begin{aligned} &[\pi_1,\pi_2] = -i\ell_{B_z}^{-2}, \\ &[\pi_2,\pi_3] = -i\ell_{B_x}^{-2}, \\ &[\pi_3,\pi_1] = [\pi_1,\pi_4] = [\pi_2,\pi_4] = 0, \\ &[\pi_3,\pi_4] = -i\ell_0^{-2}, \end{aligned} \tag{S3}$$

where the three length scales are given by $\ell_{B_z} = 1/\sqrt{eB_z}, \ell_{B_x} = 1/\sqrt{eB_x}, \ell_0 = \sqrt{m\omega_0}$. We can thus define two sets of coupled harmonic oscillators as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\ell_{B_z}(\pi_1 - i\pi_2), \qquad b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\ell_0(\pi_3 - i\pi_4), \\ &[a,a^\dagger] = [b,b^\dagger] = 1, \\ &[a,b] = [a,b^\dagger] = -\frac{1}{2}\ell_{B_z}\ell_0\ell_{B_x}^{-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{S4}$$

The Hamiltonian can now be rewritten as

$$H = \frac{1}{2ml_{B_z}^2}\left(a^\dagger a + aa^\dagger\right) + \frac{1}{2ml_0^2}\left(b^\dagger b + bb^\dagger\right). \tag{S5}$$

One can perform a proper Bogoliubov transformation to decouple the two sets of ladder operators and bring the Hamiltonian into the normal form. It is important to choose a right set of parameters to deal with the transformation. Without loss of generality, we can set $\omega_z = 1/\left(m\ell_{B_z}^2\right) = 1$, so the parallel field and the confining potential strength are all measured with respect to the perpendicular field. We define the following parameters

$$\epsilon_1 = 1+\omega_0^2+\omega_x^2, \qquad \epsilon_2 = \omega_0^2, \tag{S6}$$

$$\omega_1^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\epsilon_1 - \sqrt{\epsilon_1^2-\epsilon_2^2}\right), \tag{S7}$$

$$\omega_2^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\epsilon_1 + \sqrt{\epsilon_1^2-\epsilon_2^2}\right), \tag{S8}$$

where $\pm\omega_1$ and $\pm\omega_2$ are actually the eigenvalues, or the characteristic frequencies of the decoupled oscillators $X, X^\dagger$ and $Y, Y^\dagger$ in the Hamiltonian, and $\omega_x = 1/\left(m\ell_{B_x}^2\right)$.The single particle Hilbert space is thus built from these two sets of decoupled ladder operators, which we label as $|m,n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m!n!}}\left(X^\dagger\right)^m\left(Y^\dagger\right)^n|0\rangle$, m, n are non-negative integers. The Landau level is now indexed by two integers

$$|m,n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m!n!}}\left(X^\dagger\right)^m\left(Y^\dagger\right)^n|0\rangle,$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum state. In Fig.(4) in the Main Text, we are looking at the LLL state given by $|0,0\rangle$ and the 1LL state given by $|1,0\rangle$. The 1LL is the second lowest single particle energy state when $\omega_0 > \omega_z$.

We now look at the density-density interaction Hamiltonian with a bare Coulomb interaction

$$H_{\text{int}} = \int d^3q V_{\vec{q}}\rho_q\rho_{-q}, \tag{S9}$$

where $V_{\vec{q}} = 1/q^2$ is the Fourier components of the Coulomb interaction, and $\rho_q = \sum_i e^{i\vec{q}\cdot r}$ is the density operator. Let us define the usual cyclotron and guiding center coordinates as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{R}^1 = \ell_{B_z}^2\pi_2, \qquad \tilde{R}^2 = -\ell_{B_z}^2\pi_1, \\ &\bar{R}^a = r^a - \tilde{R}^a, a = 1,2, \\ &[\tilde{R}^a,\tilde{R}^b] = -[\bar{R}^a,\bar{R}^b] = -i\ell_{B_z}^2\epsilon^{ab}, \\ &[\tilde{R}^a,\bar{R}^b] = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{S10}$$

The part relevant to the Landau level form factor is thus given by $\langle m,n|e^{i\left(q_1\tilde{R}^1+q_2\tilde{R}^2+q_3r^3\right)}|m,n\rangle$. To get the form factor it is useful to define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x,y) &= \frac{(4+x)(4-y)\sqrt{x}}{16(x-y)}, \\ f_2(x,y) &= \frac{(4-x)(4-y)\sqrt{x}}{32(x-y)}, \\ f_3(x,y) &= \frac{\sqrt{x(4-x)(4-y)}}{4\sqrt{2}(x-y)}, \\ f_4(x,y) &= \frac{x-4}{\sqrt{x}(x-y)}. \end{aligned} \tag{S11}$$

The form factor is thus given by

$$F_{mn}(\vec{q},q_3) = \langle m,n|e^{i\left(q_1\tilde{R}^1+q_2\tilde{R}^2+q_3r^3\right)}|m,n\rangle. \tag{S12}$$

Using the functions f_i, the form factor can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &F_{mn}(\vec{q},q_3) = \\ &= \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(f_1\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)+f_1\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)\right)\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*\right)\} \times \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(f_2\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)+f_2\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)\right)\left(\mathbf{q}^2+\mathbf{q}^{*2}\right)\right)\} \\ &\times \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(f_3\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)+f_3\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)\right)q_3\left(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}^*\right)\right)\} \times \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(f_4\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)+f_4\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)\right)q_3^2\right)\} \\ &\quad\times\mathcal{L}_m\left(f_1\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*+f_2\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)\left(\mathbf{q}^2+\mathbf{q}^{*2}\right)+f_3\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)q_3\left(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}^*\right)+f_4\left(\omega_1^2,\omega_2^2\right)q_3^2\right) \\ &\quad\times\mathcal{L}_n\left(f_1\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*+f_2\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)\left(\mathbf{q}^2+\mathbf{q}^{*2}\right)+f_3\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)q_3\left(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}^*\right)+f_4\left(\omega_2^2,\omega_1^2\right)q_3^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{S13}$$

where $\mathbf{q}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(q_1-iq_2), \vec{q}=(q_1,q_2)$. The effective two-body interaction is thus given by $\tilde{V}_{\vec{q},q_3}=\frac{1}{q^2}|F_{mn}(q)|^2$. One still needs to integrate over q_3 to get the effective 2D interaction:

$$V_{\vec{q}}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}dq_3\tilde{V}_{\vec{q},q_3}F_{mn}^2. \tag{S14}$$

This can be done numerically as the next step, and $V_{\vec{q}}$ in Eq.(S14) is used to generate the generalised PPs plotted in Fig.(4).

DETAILS OF THE FCI MODEL

For illustration of the PP decomposition of an anisotropic Fractional Chern Insulator, we use a next-nearest-neighbor (NNN) 3-band Chern number $C=3$ model engineered such that it is close to "ideal" - with an almost flat band and almost uniform Berry curvature and Fubini-Study metric. It has a large band flatness ratio (ratio of bandgap vs. bandwidth) of approximately 40, mean-square fluctuation of the Berry curvature of 1.562×10^{-3} and mean-square fluctuation of the Fubini-Study metric of 1.09×10^{-2}. Note that we require at least 3-bands to have an arbitrarily uniform Berry curvature.

The single-particle part of this FCI model consists of real-space hopping elements indexed by $H_{ij}(d_x,d_y)$, where $i,j=a,b,c$ indexes the orbitals (colors) and d_x,d_y labels the unit cells at positions $d_x\hat{x}+d_y\hat{y}$. The hoppings in the $\hat{x}$ and diagonal directions are

$$H(1,0)=\begin{pmatrix} 6.65 & 4i & -6 \\ 4i & -4.87805 & 7.57576i \\ -6 & 7.57576i & -1.78571 \end{pmatrix} \tag{S15}$$

and

$$H(1,1)=\begin{pmatrix} -1.10833 & -3.125(1+i) & -3.5i \\ 3.125(1-i) & -2.94118 & 1.66667(1+i) \\ 3.5i & -1.66667(1-i) & 4 \end{pmatrix} \tag{S16}$$

Hoppings to the other NN and NNN unit cells are related by the following symmetries: Upon a spatial rotation of $\pi/2$ clockwise (i.e. $(1,1)\to(-1,1)$), H_{aa},H_{bb},H_{cc} remained unchanged, $H_{ab},H_{bc},H_{ba},H_{cb}$ are multiplied by $-i$ and H_{ac},H_{ca} are multiplied by $(-i)^2=-1$.